

General Application Requirements (FINAL)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700485

Agency Information

(Carefully read the instructions before completing this form)

1. Agency Information

- a. Agency Name USFS - Eldorado National Forest
- b. Organizational Unit 03
- c. Address 100 Forni Road
- e. City Placerville State CA Zip 95667
- f. Federal Id Number 53-0661521 DUNS Number 2000000001-03
- g. Agency fiscal year (beginning month and day) October-01
- h. Agency Type (Please check one)
- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input type="radio"/> City | <input type="radio"/> County | <input checked="" type="radio"/> U.S. Forest Service |
| <input type="radio"/> U.S. Forest Service - Patrol District | <input type="radio"/> U.S. Bureau of Land Management | <input type="radio"/> Other Federal Agency |
| <input type="radio"/> Federally Recognized Native American Tribe | <input type="radio"/> Educational Institution | <input type="radio"/> Nonprofit Organization - 501(c)(3) status only |
| <input type="radio"/> State Agency | <input type="radio"/> District | |

2. Project Information

- a. Project Name General Application Requirements
- b. Is implementing agency same as Agency (Please select Yes or No) ☒ Yes ☐ No
- c. Implementing Agency Name
- d. Amount of Funds Requested Project Cost

Project Request(s) Summary

#	Project Type	Project Title	Grant Request	Match	Total Project Cost

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # _____

APP # 700485

3. Contact

a. Authorized Representative

Name	Ramiro Villalvazo					
Title	Forest Supervisor					
Mailing Address	Eldorado National Forest					
City	Placerville	State	CA	Zip	95667	
Telephone	(530) 622-5061			Fax	(530) 621-5297	
E-mail Address	rvillalvazo@fs.fed.us					

b. Project Administrator

Name	Lester Lubetkin					
Title	Forest Recreation Officer					
Mailing Address	Eldorado National Forest					
City	Placerville	State	CA	Zip	95667	
Telephone	(530) 621-5213			Fax	(530) 621-5297	
E-mail Address	llubetkin@fs.fed.us					

Location Map

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700485

A. Location Map

Attachments:

[Location Map](#)

Equipment Inventory

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700485

A. Equipment Inventory

Has your agency purchased any Equipment with OHV Trust Funds within the last five (5) years? (Please select Yes or No) ☒ Yes ☐ No

#	Item Description	Make	Model	Model Year	Vehicle Identification Number (VIN) or Serial Number	Project Agreement Number
1	All Terrain Vehicle	Polaris	Sportsman 400	2005	4XAMH42A25B412351	OR-2-E-56
2	All Terrain Vehicle	Polaris	Sportsman 400	2005	4XAMH42A25B412353	OR-2-E-56
3	Motorcycle	Pitster	Pro X4	2007	A2BDR4437U006269	G07-02-03-L01
4	Motorcycle	Kawasaki	KLX 140Lcc	2008	JKBLXPB188DA01515	G07-02-03-L01
5	Snowmobile	Arctic Cat	M-8 800cc	2009	4UF09SNW99T105526	G07-02-03-L01
6	Snowmobile	Arctic Cat	M-8 800cc	2009	4UF09SNW39T107580	G07-02-03-L01
7	Motorcycle	Kawasaki	KLX 250cc	2009	JKALXMT129DA02758	G07-02-03-L01
8	Motorcycle	Honda	CRF 250X	2008	JH2ME11068M400423	G08-02-03-G01
9	Mini-excavator	Kubota	K-008-3	2009	20346	G08-02-03-G01
10	Rock Breaker attachment for excavator	Kubota	KXB310Q	2008	K3110044	G08-02-03-G01

Habitat Management Program (HMP)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700485

PART 1 - ITEM 1. DETERMINE THE NEED FOR FULL FULL HABITAT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (HMP)

All Applicants submitting Projects involving Ground Disturbing Activities are subject to HMP requirements. The HMP must cover the combined Project Area of all proposed Projects with Ground Disturbing Activities.

Applicants able to certify that none of the proposed activities listed in the Application in areas open to legal OHV Recreation contain any risk factors to special-status species and/or sensitive habitats shall submit only HMP Part 1. Applicants who cannot certify that the proposed activities listed in the Application in areas open to legal OHV Recreation do not contain any risk factors to special-status species and/or sensitive habitats shall submit HMP Parts 1 and 2.

1. Do any of your proposed projects involve Ground Disturbing Activities? (Please select Yes or No) ☒ Yes ☐ No
2. Can the Applicant certify that none of the proposed Projects with Ground Disturbing Activities in areas open to legal OHV Recreation contain any risk factors to special-status species and/or sensitive habitats? (If you checked 'Yes', you are done with HMP) (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No

PART 2 - RISK ANALYSIS, MANAGEMENT PROGRAM AND REPORTING

PART 2 - Section I. Summary of HMP Changes

Has the Applicant previously submitted a HMP Part 2 that is currently in use in the proposed Project Area? (Please select Yes or No) ☒ Yes ☐ No

Table 1 - Summary of HMP Changes

Changes from Previous Year	Section Where Change Occurs
No Change	No Change

PART 2 - Section II - Special Status Species

Table 2 - Table of All Special-Status Species and Any Other Species of Local Concern That Were Considered for Inclusion in the HMP

Species	Listing Status	Habitat	Potential for Occurrence	Addressed by HMP? If not explain why?

PART 2 - Section III - Map(s) of Project Area

PART 2 - Section IV. - Management/Monitoring Program by Species and Sensitive Habitat

PART 2 - Section IV. - Management/Monitoring Program by Species and Sensitive Habitat - Table 3

Table 3 - Data (Including Baseline Data) and Management Program for Species and/or Sensitive Habitats

Species/Habitat	Known Information	Methodology	Concerns / Risks / Uncertainties	Management Objective(s)	Management Action(s)	Success Criteria

PART 2 - Section IV. - Management/Monitoring Program by Species and Sensitive Habitat - Table 4

Table 4: Summary of HMP Monitoring Program

Species/Habitat	Change Detection Methodology	Effectiveness Monitoring Methodology, Including Triggers	Identify Any Applicable Validation Monitoring (Focused Studies)

PART 2 - Section IV. - Management/Monitoring Program by Species and Sensitive Habitat - Table 5

Table 5. Management Review and Response; Adaptive Management

Monitoring Methodology	How Monitoring Information Will Inform Management	How Data Will Be Analyzed	Management Response to Identified Triggers	Who Will Plan Management Response

PART 2 - Section V. - Previous Year's Monitoring Results and Management Actions Based on Monitoring Results

PART 2 - Section V. - Previous Year's Monitoring Results and Management Actions Based on Monitoring Results - Table 6

Table 6: Previous Year's Monitoring Results

Monitoring Accomplishments	Results	Were Objectives and Success Criteria Achieved?
In the two field seasons of 2008 and 2009, wildlife crews conducted spotted owl surveys on approximately 2,780 acres surrounding the Gold Note OHV trail system in the Sopiago watershed on the Amador RD of the Eldorado NF.	In 2009, Spotted Owl surveys were conducted in the Sopiago spotted owl PAC survey areas. These survey areas are located near the Gold Note OHV trail system. Two of these PACs had spotted owl responses in 2009; one PAC ED020 had verified reproduction. ED145 had a nighttime response but nesting status was not verified as there were fewer surveys conducted than required under the spotted owl survey protocol standards. Surveys indicate continued presence of spotted owls within the Sopiago area, but status was not confirmed for individual PACs as protocol was not	Survey objectives were accomplished. Additional spotted owl surveys to be conducted in 2010 to determine if success criteria are being achieved.

	completed.	
In 2009 on the Georgetown Ranger District in the Rock Creek Recreational Management Area, two northern goshawk PACs were surveyed: G08_02 and G23_05. A total of 400 acres were surveyed.	G08_02 was the only one of these PACs that had any responses, with a single vocal non-approach in April, and a vocal approach by a pair in July. Stand searches were conducted of the area, but no juveniles were found.	Survey objectives were accomplished. All goshawk PACs were surveyed to protocol
In 2009 on the Georgetown Ranger District in the Rock Creek Recreational Management Area, nine California Spotted Owl PACs were surveyed in Rock Creek during the 2009 field season: ELD013, ELD014, ELD015, ELD071, ELD073, ELD075, ELD191, ELD301, and ELD307. A total of 2,700 acres were surveyed.	ELD307 was confirmed to have a nesting and reproductive pair with two successful fledglings. ELD072 and ELD301 are inferred to have non-nesting, non-reproductive pairs. A pair was heard from the borders of ELD015, but no follow-up was conducted. ELD014 and ELD015 were only surveyed once, while ELD075 was surveyed twice, all due to area closures as a result of possible marijuana cultivation in the area.	Most survey objectives were accomplished. However, ELD0075, ELD0014 and ELD0015 were not surveyed to protocol and will have to be resurveyed to protocol in future years.
In the field season of 2009, wildlife crews conducted spotted owl and northern goshawk surveys in the Airport Flat and South Fork Road areas on Pacific RD of the Eldorado NF.	Approximately 1,500 acres of goshawk monitoring was performed. Approximately 3,500 acres of spotted owl monitoring was performed. The 3 owl PACs in this area were all found to not have reproduced this year. The cause of this lack of reproduction is unknown.	Survey objectives were accomplished. Additional spotted owl monitoring efforts to be conducted in 2010, depending on funding, of 3 established owl PACs near the Deer Creek OHV/hiking trail in the Rubicon Canyon.
On the Placerville RD, wildlife crews conducted surveys for the California spotted owl during the 2009 field season following the Forest Service Region 5 California Spotted Owl Protocol. Survey coverage was focused around the established California spotted owl Protected Activity Centers (PACs) in the Elkins Flat OHV Trail area and nearby project areas (Big Dog, Tony's, and Raintree) to determine current use of these 11 PACs.	The 2009 spotted owl survey results indicate that 6 of the 11 PACs had at least one spotted owl present. All of the results mentioned are within two miles of the Elkins Flat OHV Trail area. In the Elkins project area, a non-territorial adult of unidentified gender was detected near ED-208, an adult of unidentified gender was detected twice in ED-162, a confirmed breeding pair was detected in ED-063, and a confirmed non-reproductive pair was detected in ED-115 during a survey in Big Dog, which overlaps the Elkins project area. Also in the Big Dog project area, a non-territorial adult of unidentified gender was detected. In Raintree, a confirmed breeding pair was detected in ED-199. In Tony's, a	Survey objectives were accomplished for the California spotted owl.

	confirmed breeding pair was detected in ED-011 and a non-territorial female and adult of unidentified gender were detected.	
Stream surveys were conducted for Calif Red-legged Frogs in 2009 within the Rock Creek Area, Georgetown RD.	The Calif Red-legged Frog (CRLF) stream surveys identified 3 locations with occurrences of individual CRLFs within dispersal habitat not considered to be suitable for breeding populations. Additionally a breeding habitat was located on private land.	Survey objectives were accomplished. Additional surveys to be conducted in 2010 to identify whether other streams in the Rock Creek area have dispersing CRLF and /or breeding populations.
Pacific Southwest Region OHV/OSV, Wildlife, and Plant Monitoring (for details on methodology, see pages 18-41 of the Monitoring Plan on file with the OHMVR Division).	In 2009, data were analyzed from Regional programmatic monitoring performed in association with the Vertebrate Assemblage Focused Study. Data were collected at randomly selected OHV Use and Non-Use Sites include: habitat condition (including forest composition and structure and ground cover); occurrence and status of wildlife & plant species (including special status plants, small mammals, landbirds, owls, accipiters, carnivores, and other vertebrates); and human use, including OHV use by type and frequency.	Data analyzed to date infer that success criteria have been achieved.
Regional Marten Focused Study (for details on methodology, see the Study plan on file with the OHMVR Division).	The final report for the focused study was published in March 2007. The results show that marten occupancy, daily activity, gender ratio, or probability of detection did not change in relation to the presence or absence of motorized routes and OHV/OSV use when the routes (plus a 50 meter buffer) did not exceed about 20 percent of a 50 square kilometer area, and traffic did not exceed an average of one vehicle every 2 hours. The spatial and temporal frequencies of OHV/OSV were not perceived by marten as significant threats at the two study sites.	Results show that success criteria have been achieved
Regional Northern Goshawk Focused Study (for details on methodology, see the Study plan on file with the OHMVR Division).	In 2009, this study focused on finalizing data collect and beginning full data analysis of OHV/OSV effects including sound levels for northern goshawk on Plumas National Forest. Data have been collected on hawk behavior	Final data analysis began in 2008 and will be completed in 2010. Data analyzed to date infer that success criteria have been achieved.

	and reproductive success with paired OHV use and hiker experiments. Radio-tagged dispersing juveniles and foraging adults were tracked.	
Regional Vertebrate Assemblage Focused Study (for details on methodology, see the Study plan on file with the OHMVR Division).	In 2009, this study focused on full data analysis of OHV effects on the Vertebrate Assemblage, including small mammal communities, landbird communities, mammalian carnivores, accipiters, and owls, in the montane forests of the central Sierra Nevada.	Final data analysis will be completed in 2010. Data analyzed to date infer that success criteria have been achieved.
On the Placerville RD, wildlife crews conducted surveys for the northern goshawk during the 2009 field season following the National Goshawk Monitoring Protocol. Survey coverage was focused around the established northern goshawk PACs adjacent to the Elkins Flat OHV Trail area in the Raintree project area to determine the current use of these PACs. However surveys did not occur within the Elkins Flat OHV Trail area	The 2009 northern goshawk survey results indicate that one of the adjacent PACs had at least one goshawk present. An adult of unidentified gender and a nest with no evidence of use were detected in G27-09. No surveys for goshawks were conducted within the Elkins Flat OHV area.	Northern goshawk surveys for the Tony's project, to be conducted in 2010 may help determine presence and status in the area which overlaps the western boundary of the Elkins Flat OHV Trail area.

PART 2 - Section V. - Previous Year's Monitoring Results and Management Actions Based on Monitoring Results - Table 7

Table 7: Management Actions Based on Monitoring Results

Management Actions	Species/ Habitat	Date Completed or Planned - mm/dd/yyyy	Changes Needed to HMP
Continue monitoring of Northern goshawk and California spotted owl in concentrated OHV areas.	Northern goshawk and California spotted owl	10/31/2010	No needed changes have been identified for California spotted owl monitoring. Additional monitoring for Northern goshawk should be conducted in the Elkins Flat area
Following observations of the CRLF individuals, informal consultation was conducted with representatives from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.	Calif. Red-legged Frog	06/01/2010	Currently reviewing Rock Creek Recreational Trails Area management direction to determine if any changes are needed, based on CRLF observations and input from US F&WS.

PART 2 - Section V. - Previous Year's Monitoring Results and Management Actions Based on Monitoring Results - Table 8

Table 8 Management Actions Taken in Response to HMP-related Public Concerns

Concern Raised by Public	Actions Taken to Address the Concern
Public was concerned that surveys were completed too close to enduro event and a re-route was difficult with a limited time frame.	2009 surveys were completed a month prior to the enduro date.

Soil Conservation

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700485

A. Soil Conservation

- a. Do any of your proposed projects involve Ground Disturbing Activities? (Please select ☒ Yes ☐ No Yes or No)

B. Soil Conservation Plan

Attachments:

[Eldorado Soil Conservation Plan](#)

Public Review Process

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700485

A. Public Notification Efforts

Check all that apply: (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Notice to interested Parties/Groups (Enter date in mm/dd/yyyy format) [2/26/2010]
- ☒ Published on Applicant's Website (Enter date in mm/dd/yyyy format) [02/26/2010]
- ☐ Published in Newspaper
- ☒ News Release Issued
- ☒ Public Meeting(s) Hearing(s) Held

B. Public Comments

Comments were received from 10 individuals or groups. Comments generally related to specific projects. One was supportive of funding in general. Two letters were opposed to funding for projects, but were not specific to this application. One commenter identified an apparent discrepancy between the use data reported in the ENF's (and other Forests') application which describes the number of OHV visitor days (the number of visitor days for which visitors traveled on Forest dirt roads or trails for either OHV recreation or for access to a non-motorized recreation activity) and the use data presented in the Forest's Travel Management EIS (which displayed the number of visits for which visitors reported their primary activity was OHV recreation). The difference is that the documents are reporting different uses and whether the use is the primary activity or a related activity.

One commenter suggested that the Start/End dates shown in the General Evaluation Criteria be for a more recent year. The date shown is for the most recent year for which the Forest has accurate use counts, as required by the instructions in OLGA. The following addresses other comments regarding the General Evaluation Criteria responses: the Forest does provide maps of the Rock Creek Area, Elkins Flat area and Gold Note area which show difficulty ratings on trails; the MVUM does show types of vehicles allowed to use various roads and trails and season of use limitations; and sound testing is done on most holidays and weekends in popular motorcycle areas, particularly the Rock Creek area.

One commenter pointed out that the value of volunteer labor differed among projects; this has been corrected to reflect a consistent cost for volunteers. The commenter also questioned the cost of barrier rocks and the FS match in different projects. The text was modified to provide clarification; some of the difference in costs for barrier rocks is due to differences in the cost of hauling rocks from different sources to different project sites.

Ground Operations; 3 comments were received for this project which were generally supportive. 2 commenters asked that the forest limit the amount of funding to management and/or staff so more of the funding goes to "on the ground" maintenance. The forest has attempted to do this and has found that using FS employees rather than contractors is generally more effective and efficient.

One commenter felt that the cost of the MVUM is too high and dislikes the maps. The printing cost is based on actual cost and the MVUM is following the national template and cannot be modified. The Forest is working on another map that will be easier to navigate with (projected to be available in late-summer 2010). A concern was raised about whether the trail mileage warrants the amount of use of the SWECO proposed. There are over 175 miles of motorcycle trails on the Forest and another 35 miles of ATV trails. The commenter asked about the cost for the SWECO operator training. The text has been expanded to provide clarification of the costs and the number of participants has been reduced which reduced the total cost for training.

Planning - Rubicon Trail Dispersed Use; two commenters provided support for this project. They asked that the project be described more as designating routes to provide access for dispersed use, rather than designating dispersed use areas. This clarification has been made in the application. One commenter suggested various edits within the project description and evaluation criteria, some of which were made (modifying the types of uses and use counts and description of future funding sources).

Development – Long Canyon Dispersed Camping; one commenter supported the project but asked that the description clarify that the Forest is not “developing” a dispersed camping area. The text was modified to identify that the site is being hardened while not creating a fully developed campground.

Restoration – Silver Fork Road Barriers; two commenters supported this project.

Restoration – Bassi/Millionaire Unauthorized Routes; two commenters supported this project. The cost of future operations was changed to reflect funding from other than volunteers.

Restoration – Cable Road Unauthorized Routes; three comments were received for this project, two of which were supportive of the project. One commenter requested that their groups not be named as a partner in this project, and their groups’ names were removed. One commenter made suggestions for editing the evaluation criteria responses and raised a concern that OHVs were not responsible for the dumping. While the unauthorized motor vehicle use may not be for strictly recreational purposes, the vehicles accessing these areas are OHVs under the vehicle code.

C. Application Development as a result of Public Comments

- a. Were changes made to the Application as a result of public comments? (Please select ☒ Yes ☐ No Yes or No)

- b. Describe how public comments affected the Application

As described in the previous section, corrections were made in the Project Cost Estimate tabs for several projects to (1) reflect a consistent cost for volunteers between projects, (2) more accurately reflect the cost of SWECO operator training, and (3) reflect the accurate cost of barrier rocks and better explain differences between projects. Other corrections were made to the project description or project evaluation criteria sections of several projects regarding (1) distinguishing between access for dispersed camping and designating dispersed camping (Planning - Rubicon Trail project), (2) not developing dispersed camping areas into developed campgrounds (Development - Long Canyon project), and (3) not listing certain groups as partners in one restoration project (Restoration - Cable Road project).

Certifications

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700485

1. Applicant Certifications

A. General Conditions

- A. The Applicant hereby certifies, under the penalty of perjury, compliance with the following terms and conditions: ☒
1. If the Project involves a Ground Disturbing Activity, the Applicant agrees to monitor the condition of soils and wildlife in the Project Area each year in order to determine whether the soil conservation standard adopted pursuant to Public Resource Code (PRC), Section 5090.35 and the HMP prepared pursuant to Section 5090.53(a) are being met.
 2. If the Project involves a Ground Disturbing Activity, the Applicant agrees that, whenever the soil conservation standard adopted pursuant to PRC Section 5090.35 is not being met in any portion of a Project Area, the recipient shall close temporarily that noncompliant portion, to repair and prevent accelerated erosion, until the same soil conservation standard adopted pursuant to PRC Section 5090.35 is met.
 3. If the Project involves a Ground Disturbing Activity, the Applicant agrees that, whenever the HMP prepared pursuant to PRC Section 5090.53(a) is not being met in any portion of a Project Area, the recipient shall close temporarily that noncompliant portion until the same HMP prepared pursuant to PRC Section 5090.53(a) is met.
 4. The Applicant agrees to enforce the registration of off-highway motor vehicles and the other provisions of Division 16.5 (commencing with Section 38000) of the Vehicle Code and to enforce the other applicable laws regarding the operation of off-highway motor vehicles.
 5. The Applicant agrees to cooperate with appropriate law enforcement entities to provide proper law enforcement at and around the Facility.
 6. The Applicant's Project is in accordance with local or federal plans and the strategic plan for OHV Recreation prepared by the OHMVR Division.

B. Programmatic Conditions

B. The Applicant must describe the following programmatic conditions:

1. Identify the potential for the facility to reduce illegal and unauthorized OHV Recreation activities in the surrounding areas:

To prevent OHV intrusion into closed or sensitive area, the ENF will enforce the Motor Vehicle Use Map restricting motor vehicle travel off designated roads or trails. This restriction protects semi-primitive non-motorized areas, research natural areas, meadows, and other sensitive areas. The Forest utilizes FPO and LEO patrols to enforce the MVUM. The Forest also educates the public about the restrictions by regularly producing press releases, posting information on our website, bulletin boards, in offices, etc., and by attending public events and meetings, County Fairs, club meetings and events, etc. The Forest has installed signs, barriers, and gates to prohibit travel in sensitive areas. Enforcement of the MVUM will prevent some incursions into private land, particularly where the private landowners have attempted to restrict access to their lands.
2. Describe how the Applicant is meeting the operations and maintenance needs of any existing OHV Recreation Facility under its jurisdiction:

The ENF is applying for ground operations funding to supplement federal funds received by the Agency, along with other partnerships and volunteer efforts. The Forest has hired seasonal and permanent staff to complete road and trail maintenance, install and maintain signs and barriers, and maintain other facilities that support OHV recreation. We have also been working diligently with various clubs and groups to complete volunteer trail maintenance projects as well as to provide public information and education.

C. Fee Collection

Describe how fees collected pursuant to Section 38230 of the Vehicle Code (in-lieu funds) are utilized and whether the fees complement the Applicant's proposed Project:

D. Compliance with PRC 5090.50(b)(1)(C)

Projects within the O&M category that affect lands identified as inventoried roadless areas by the U.S. Forest Service, are compliant with PRC 5090.50(b)(1)(C). (Please select Yes or No)



Yes



No

2. Governing Body Resolution

Certification - Non Profits / Education

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700485

- 1. Written Agreement with Land Manager**
- 2. Verification of Nonprofit 501(c)(3) Status**

Evaluation Criteria

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700485

1. OHV Visitor Opportunity Summary

1 OHV Visitor Opportunity Summary

- a. Does the land manager agency provide legal OHV riding opportunity? (Please select ☒ Yes ☐ No Yes or No)

Starting (Month/Year) 10/2006

Ending (Month/Year) 09/2007

- b. Off-Highway Vehicle Opportunity Ratio (OHV Ratio) opportunity

- i. Months of OHV Opportunity (OHV Months) 12

- ii. Total Miles Of Routes Available For OHV Recreation 1212

- iii. Total Acres Of Open Riding Available For OHV Recreation 25000

- iv. OHV Visitation (visitor days) 431250

- v. Ratio of OHV Visitation/OHV Opportunity 16.45

1 OHV Visitor Opportunity Summary (2)

- c. Reference Document that support the responses to a. and b. on previous page

Eldorado Travel Management FEIS, Eldorado Nat'l Visitor Use Monitoring

- d. Visitor Opportunity Ratio (V/O Ratio) = OHV Ratio x OHV Months / 12 16.45

Visitor Opportunity Ratio (V/O Ratio) Score

2. Quality of OHV Opportunity

Land Manager's OHV program 12

Check all that apply (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Map with OHV Recreation opportunities clearly shown is available for distribution at no cost (2 points)
☒ Map with OHV Recreation opportunities clearly shown is available on the Land Manager's website (2 points)
☒ Map indicates relative difficulty of each OHV trail (2 points)
☒ Map indicates appropriate OHV use type (ATV, dirt bike, 4x4, OSV, etc.) (2 points)
☒ At least fifty percent of the staging areas include support facilities (restrooms, picnic tables, trash cans, shade structures) (2 points)
☒ Majority of trail intersections are signed with information such as: trail names, directional signs, relative difficulty, mileage to next feature (2 points)

3. Variety of OHV Opportunity

- a. Skill levels (e.g., beginner, intermediate, advanced) indicated by publicly available maps or signage marking trails with relative difficulty 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ 3 or more skill levels (5 points) ☐ 2 skill levels (3 points)
☐ 1 skill level (1 point) ☐ Land Manager has no legal OHV riding opportunity (No points)

- b. Type of OHV Opportunity (ATV, dirt bike, 4x4, OSV, RUV, Sand Rail/Dune Buggy) 6

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ Opportunities for 3 or more vehicle types (6 points) ☐ Opportunities for 2 vehicle types (3 points)
☐ Opportunity for only 1 vehicle type (1 point) ☐ Land Manager has no legal OHV riding opportunity (No points)

4. Agency Contribution

Is the cost of OHV Program for Land Manager's most recent complete fiscal year (not to include Indirect Costs) greater than \$0? ☒ Yes ☐ No
If NO, then No points. Go to item #5. (Please select Yes or No)

If YES, enter cost of OHV Program for Land Manager's most recent complete fiscal year (not to include Indirect Costs): 767300

% Funded by OHV Trust Fund (do not include in-lieu funds): 1

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ No OHV Trust Funds were used (6 points)
☐ 10% or less of the program cost was from OHV Trust Fund (4 points)
☐ 11% to 25% of the program cost was from OHV Trust Fund (3 points)
☒ 26% to 50% of the program cost was from OHV Trust Fund (1 point)
☐ More than 50% of the program cost was from OHV Trust Fund (No points)

Reference Document

Cost of 2009 OHV Program Management Estimate

5. Project Performance

For Applicant's OHV grant Projects which reached the end of the Project performance period within the last two years, the percentage of all deliverables accomplished 3

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ 100% of Deliverable accomplished (5 points)
☒ 75% to 99% of Deliverables accomplished (3 points)
☐ Less than 75% of Deliverables accomplished (No points)
☐ First time Applicants and past Applicants with no active Grant projects within the last two years (2 points)

6. Previous Year Performance

In the previous year the Applicant has been responsive and communicated effectively with the assigned OHMVR Grant Administrator by phone, email or personal visit. 3

FOR DIVISION USE ONLY (Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ In the previous year the Applicant has been responsive and communicated effectively with the assigned OHMVR Grant Administrator by phone, email or personal visit (3 points)
☐ First time Applicants and past Applicants with no active Grant projects within the last two years (2 points)
☐ In the previous year the Applicant has not been responsive (No points)

7. Prevention of OHV trespass

7. Prevention of OHV trespass - Fence (Page 1)

- a. Is site a completely fenced facility such that OHV trespass into neighboring properties and/or closed areas is prevented? 0

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

☒ No (answer items b and c)

☐ Yes (10 points, explain and then skip to item 8)

Explain 'Yes' response:

7. Prevention of OHV trespass - Patrol (Page 2)

- b. The majority of OHV Opportunity areas are patrolled (Check the one most appropriate) 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ At least 5 days per week (5 points)
☐ At least once per week (3 points)
☐ At least once per month (1 point)
☐ Less than once per month (No points)

Explain patrol efforts (e.g., frequency of patrol, patrol personnel, percent of lands covered by patrols)

The Forest utilizes FPOs and LEOs for patrols. Patrols are conducted on each Ranger District throughout the year, although focusing during the use periods and periods with resource protection closures. Patrols are conducted at least 5 days a week, primarily on weekends, holidays and the days leading to the weekends. Patrol staff attempt to cover as many of the open routes as possible across the Forest (1,002 miles of roads, 210 miles of trails, 60 miles of groomed snowmobile trail, and approximately 25,000 acres of area open to snowmobile riding), however they also focus on areas of special concern and closed or restricted areas. Patrols are also conducted along the wilderness boundaries, particularly associated with snowmobile intrusions into Mokelumne Wilderness.

7. Prevention of OHV trespass - Measures (Page 3)

- c. Measures to prevent OHV trespass into neighboring properties and/or closed areas 5

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Barriers and/or signing are used to prevent OHV trespass into neighboring properties and/or closed areas (3 points)
☒ Education programs, maps and/or brochures provided to the public address OHV trespass, including respect for private property (2 points)

Explain measures utilized to prevent OHV trespass into neighboring properties and/or closed areas

To prevent OHV intrusion into closed or sensitive areas, the ENF will enforce the new Motor Vehicle Use Map restricting motor vehicle travel off designated roads or trails. This restriction protects semi-primitive non-motorized areas, research natural areas, meadows, and other sensitive areas. The Forest educates the public about these restrictions by regularly producing press releases, posting information on our website, bulletin boards, in offices, etc., and by attending public events and meetings (County Fairs, club meetings and events, etc.). The Forest has installed signs, barriers, and gates to prohibit travel in sensitive areas (dwarf manzanita, Georgetown RD; wildlife habitat in Fleming Meadow area, Placerville RD; and deer winter range closure in Rock Creek area; past wilderness incursions into Mokelumne Wilderness). Enforcement of the MVUM will prevent some incursions into private land, particularly where the private landowners have attempted to restrict access to their lands.

8. OHV Education

8 OHV Education - Page 1

- a. Education materials available onsite 10

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Free literature is provided to visitors describing safe and responsible OHV recreational practices (5 points)
☒ Bulletin boards, signs or kiosks, at the majority of staging areas, trailheads, or other areas where the public gathers provide information concerning safe and responsible OHV Recreation (5 points)

- b. Applicant or Land Manager provides formal programs, educational talks, school field trips, etc. to the public to educate them on safe and responsible OHV recreational practices: 1

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ 50 or more per year (3 points) ☐ 20 to 49 times per year (2 points)
☒ 5 to 19 times per year (1 point) ☐ Less than 5 times per year (No points)

8. OHV Education - Page 2

- c. When Facility is open, staff are available at trailheads, visitor centers and/or entrance stations to provide information on safe and responsible OHV use 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ Daily (5 points) ☐ On all weekends (4 points)
☐ On the majority of weekends (2 points) ☐ On major holidays (1 points)
☐ None of the above (No points)

- d. ATV Safety Institute and/or Motorcycle Safety Foundation approved training courses are provided to the public: 0

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ At least 30 times per year (5 points) ☐ 18-29 times per year (3 points)
☐ 4-17 times per year (1 points) ☒ Less than 4 times per year (No points)

Describe Land Manager's onsite education efforts relative to items a. - d.:

Forest website provides information on responsible OHV riding practices and appropriate OHV riding opportunities. Provide a variety of maps and Recreation Opportunity Guides, i.e. Rock Creek, Elkins Flat, and Gold Note areas, Silver Bear OSV Trail, and District Motor Vehicle Use Maps. Maintain information boards at popular OHV areas; provide Travel Management, dispersed camping and cultural resource protection brochures. Public contacts at District Offices and by patrollers in the field; hand out various brochures, maps, or other information along with Tread Lightly information; two volunteer information stations hosted by OHV clubs and groups (Rubicon 4WD trail in the summer, Mormon Emigrant Trail in the winter); news releases at the beginning of the summer to inform visitors about travel restrictions. Formal presentations at Amador and El Dorado County Fairs, State Fair, C4WD convention, Watershed Education Summit.

9. Website

- a. OHV outreach efforts are accomplished through the Land Manager's website 0

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ No (skip to question 10) ☒ Yes (provide URL address and answer item b)

Provide URL address www.fs.fed.us/r5/eldorado

- b. The Land Manager's website contains the following items 5

(Check all that apply) - Scoring: 1 point each up to a maximum of 5 points. (Please select applicable values)

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Map to location | <input type="checkbox"/> Hours of operation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Safety information |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Visitor facilities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Contact information | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> News releases |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information on responsible riding | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Map of Facilities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee schedule |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Seasonal restrictions | <input type="checkbox"/> Link to Division Website | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Law enforcement contact information |

10. OHV Outreach

Check all forms of OHV outreach the Applicant utilizes: 3

Scoring: 1 point each up to a maximum of 3 points. (Please select applicable values)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Billboards | <input type="checkbox"/> CDs and/or DVDs |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community meetings | <input type="checkbox"/> OHV dealers |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fairs | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> News releases |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (specify) [OHV Club events] | <input type="checkbox"/> Television |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Parades | <input type="checkbox"/> Radio |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Programs at schools | |

11. Natural and Cultural Resources

11. Natural and Cultural Resources - Page 1

- a. Is the Land Manager's OHV area a completely fenced track facility with little or no native vegetation?
0

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ No (answer item b) ☐ Yes (5 points, explain and then skip to item 12)

Explain 'Yes' response

11. Natural and Cultural Resources - Page 2

- b. Resource Management Information System 5

Does the Land Manager maintain a management information system managed by qualified environmental staff that identifies and monitors the impacts of the OHV activity and contains at least the following:

- Ongoing survey/inventory of species
- Ongoing survey/inventory of archeological sites
- Biological monitoring that measures changes in populations
- Components that evaluate the effects of OHV recreation and related activity on the species;
- Recommendations for improvement in species management
- Strategies to respond to changing conditions that affect the survival or reproduction of species? (Please select one from list)

- ☐ No (No points) ☒ Yes (5 points)

Reference Document

ENF Land and Resource Management Plan, Habitat Management Plan, Annual Heritage Resource Report

12. Soil Management

12. Soil Management - Page 1

- a. Land Manager has developed a systematic methodology for evaluating soil conditions of its OHV Opportunities? 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ No (No points) ☒ Yes (5 points)

Explain 'Yes' response The ENF follows water quality Best Management Practices that are established at the Regional level (copies available at the Forest office). These BMPs address practices for road building and maintenance, vegetative manipulation, OHV management, management of other recreation sites, and other activities. Implementation of these BMPs protects water quality and other sensitive resources that are affected by or dependent on clean water. The Eldorado Forest Land and

Resource Management Plan (previously submitted to OHMVR Div) establishes standards and guidelines for the management of activities on the ENF. These standards and guidelines are designed to protect and enhance the viability of species across the Forest, including in the areas where OHV use occurs. Specific standards and guidelines relating to OHV use include restricting OHV use to designated roads and trails, limiting the density of roads or trails open to OHV use within deer winter range and fawning areas, avoiding roads in meadows, etc.

- b. Land Manager has developed methods to address soil issues? 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

☐ No (No points)

☒ Yes (5 points)

Explain 'Yes' response The Forest follows road and trail construction and maintenance standards, and utilizes BMPs to address soil issues during operations and new construction. The Forest utilizes the FS Region 5 standards and recommendations that were developed for OHV trail maintenance using a trail tractor and other mechanized equipment.

12. Soil Management - Page 2

- c. Land Manager performs soil monitoring 2

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

☐ Monthly (3 points)

☒ After major rain events (2 points)

☐ Annually (No points)

13. Sound Level Testing

The Applicant or Land Manager conducts, or causes to be conducted, sound level testing 4

(Check only one if applicable) (Please select one from list)

☒ On most (50% or more) holidays and weekends (4 points)

☐ At least 25% but less than 50% of holidays and weekends (2 points)

☐ Less than 25% of holidays and weekends (No points)

Describe the sound testing program

Eldorado Forest maintains 4 sound meters for use by OHV Patrollers and LEOs, and has them calibrated annually. OHV Patrollers conduct formal sound tests and enforce restrictions at times during the primary use season, and more commonly conduct courtesy and informal sound tests during the use season. Sound testing is routinely conducted during OHV events, working closely with the OHV event coordinator. The Forest submitted several hundred Sound Check cards to the OHV Division in 2008.